

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

LITEPANELS, LTD., et al.,
Plaintiffs

v.

**GVM PHOTOGRAPHIC
EQUIPMENT INC.,**
Defendant

:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:

MISC. ACTION

NO. 24-0053

ORDER

AND NOW, this 3rd day of January 2025, upon consideration of Plaintiffs’ *motion to break locks*, (ECF 7), to which no response has been filed, it is hereby **ORDERED** that the motion is **DENIED**, without prejudice.¹

BY THE COURT:

/s/ Nitza I. Quiñones Alejandro

NITZA I. QUIÑONES ALEJANDRO

Judge, United States District Court

¹ Plaintiffs Litepanels, Ltd., and Vivendum Production Solutions, Inc. (collectively, “Plaintiffs”) commenced this miscellaneous action in order to execute on a judgment entered against Defendant GVM Photographic Equipment, Inc. (“Defendant”) in the United States District Court for the District of New Jersey (the “New Jersey Judgment”). Specifically, Plaintiff seeks to execute on the New Jersey Judgment against property maintained by Defendant in a warehouse located at 12285 McNulty Road, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania (the “Warehouse”). In furtherance of this execution on Defendant’s property, on October 30, 2024, the United States Marshal conducted a levy at the Warehouse and levied the inventory and equipment contained in the Warehouse.

By way of the underlying motion, Plaintiffs seek an Order authorizing the United States Marshal “to break locks” and enter the Warehouse “by force if necessary” to effectuate a Marshal’s sale of the inventoried property. In support of this request, Plaintiffs allege “upon information and belief” that: (1) the warehouse “*may*” be locked; (2) Defendants “*may not cooperate*,” and (3) “it *may be necessary* to break locks or enter the Warehouse by force to gain access to the levied inventory and equipment.” (Pls.’ Mtn., ECF 7, at ¶¶ 7-8) (emphasis added). Notably, Plaintiffs provide no legal support for such drastic action. Regardless, this Court will not authorize such action based solely on Plaintiffs’ “information and belief” about what “may” occur and what “may” be necessary. Accordingly, Plaintiffs’ motion is denied, without prejudice.